



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

verbs, we should suggest, as a help in teaching the irregularities of verbs like *acquerir*, *mourir*, *valoir*, etc., the use of seven principal parts, *i. e.*, the addition of the Future and the Pres. Subjunctive. In general, throughout the book, we should suggest that when giving the first simple rules which are to be modified in later lessons, Mr. François should more frequently prepare the pupil for such subsequent modifications. With the average pupil a first impression is very tenacious. Having learned in § 501 that a repeated conjunction is replaced by *que* "followed by the tense and the mood required by the first conjunction," he may find it difficult to remember the rule given in § 520 to the effect that "*que* replacing the conjunction *si*, is followed by the subjunctive."

No notice of this trustworthy grammar would be complete without mention of the appendix, where may be found tabulated in fairly convenient form those paradigms of which the *disjecta membra* are to be found in the preceding pages.

A. G. H. SPIERS.

Haverford College.

Consuelo, comedia en tres actos y en verso, por ADELARDO LÓPEZ DE AYALA. Edited with introduction and notes by AURELIO M. ESPINOSA. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1911. 16mo., x + 212 pp.

No other of Ayala's plays has, to my knowledge, received editing for the use of American students. In his preface, Professor Espinosa indicates that the present volume is destined "for use in the advanced Spanish classes of the colleges and universities of the United States." Ayala's position in the last century is that of a dramatic poet whose work aided largely the reestablishment of correct theatrical taste in Spain, who defined and established rules of dramatic art in conformity with the modern spirit, and who reconciled warring schools and tendencies. While the difficulties of the author's style are not unusually great, the general excellence of his work, and of the present play

in particular, from the view-point of artistic literary workmanship, and the remarkable adaptability of its plot to logical analysis, make the text chosen a singularly happy one for classes whose members may be supposed to be, at least to some extent, students of literature as such. Pupils of this grade will have the added advantage of being able to study the play in the light of the author's own analysis of its plot and characters,—a fact worthy of more attention than the mere mention in the editor's preface. Finally, the introductory material includes a list of the principal sources of biographical and critical material.

The introduction, which aims at suggestiveness rather than completeness, acquaints the student with the essential facts in the author's life and with his position in literary history. I note, however, a few errors of detail. There is no play of Ayala's entitled *La Primita y el luto*; *La primita y el tutor* is no doubt intended. The author's university career at Seville was limited to a year or so and he could hardly have finished the course. It is not made clear that *Los dos Guzmanes* and the play of the same name mentioned on the following page are the same early effort, written in 1843 at the age of sixteen and played for the first time March 20, 1851. *Castigo y perdón* (the definite articles do not appear on the title page) was first produced November 21, 1851. Ayala was president of the lower house of the Spanish Cortes, the Congreso de los Diputados, not of the Cortes itself.

The editor follows Fitzmaurice-Kelly (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. s. v. Ayala) and Blanco García (p. 175) in giving the date of Ayala's death as January 30, 1879. P.A. de Alarcón (Preface to vol. VII of the *Obras*, p. 8), and J. O. Picón (*Autores dramáticos contemporáneos*, vol. II, p. 398), as well as the writer of the article in Montaner y Simón's *Diccionario enciclopédico*, give December 30 of the same year (1879). Alarcón and Picón were writing but a few years after the death of the dramatist and must have known him well. Conclusive evidence is furnished, however, by the Madrid dispatch to the London *Times* of December 31, 1879. This dispatch, dated De-

cember 30, 1879, puts his death "at 3 o'clock this afternoon, after a short illness," and adds that "he was universally respected both for his personal merits and his conscientious conduct during a long political career."

Finally, some account of the principles of Spanish versification would add to the convenience of the book for those students who may not have at hand either of the two excellent articles mentioned in the preface.

The text followed is that of the *Colección de escritores castellanos dramáticos, Obras completas de D. Adelardo López de Ayala*, v. III (1882), the accentuation being slightly altered in some cases to conform to present day rules. Galician words appear in italics.¹

The notes are very full and cover practically all of the points which should present difficulty to advanced students. The frequent grammatical references to Ramsey and to Bello-Cuervo are of great utility. The translations are rather numerous (some teachers might perhaps find them too much so), but they refer, for the most part, to somewhat odd Spanish idioms or colloquialisms. One is especially grateful for the note which directs the student to bear in mind the psychology of the situation in translating such expressions as ¡Dios!, ¡Jesus!, and the like. The following suggestions, though each of small importance in itself, may as a whole add slightly to the completeness of the notes:

Page 6, line 7, *se me antoja*. The translation suggested, "I have a mind to", does not fit well into the context. Rita has an explanation of her own for Consuelo's unusually careful toilet, and her words seem to mean, 'I fancy', or 'It occurs to me . . . '.

P. 20, l. 30. *De que* should be translated 'that'.

P. 28, l. 13. *¿De qué?* refers to *Sea enhorabuena*.

P. 35, l. 4 should have a note explaining that *para* is from *parar* and that its subject is *él* (understood) referring to *mozo* (l. 3).

¹ In this connection the following corrections should be made: P. 76, l. 16, *muñeira*; p. 146, l. 13, *faga*; p. 149, l. 20, *pallares*; p. 150, l. 4, *non*; p. 151, l. 21, *populares*.

P. 40, l. 11, *Para, si logra parar*. *Para* is again the present indicative of *parar*, and not *para* is from *parar* and that its subject is *él* 134, l. 18.)

P. 45, l. 9, *los civiles*. It would be well perhaps to indicate the nature of this fine body of men.

P. 51, l. 25. The Royal Academy of Fine Arts does not now, I believe, contain any paintings by Velazquez, these having been removed with others to the Prado about ten years ago. The most notable pictures remaining are those by Goya, Murillo, Ribera and Zubarán.

P. 57, l. 6, *Lo de Fernando*. 'The affair with Fernando', meaning their tacit engagement.

P. 71, l. 7 *¿Vuelve ya?*. The translation given, "Is she coming too?", has little meaning, even if "too" is a misprint for "to". The question is addressed to Lorenzo and concerns Ricardo, whose return Consuelo has been dreading. (Cf. p. 70, l. 7 and p. 71, l. 10.)

P. 74, l. 5. *Engatusar* means 'to inveigle'.

P. 74, l. 6, *paisana*. Translate 'country-woman'.

P. 80, l. 6 should perhaps have a note calling attention to the somewhat feeble witticism of *ancha* and *estrecha*.

P. 97, l. 4. The *Goupil* of the text is evidently the well known Maison Goupil, founded in Paris in 1827 and still engaged in the business of publishing artistic reproductions and *éditions de luxe*. It is apparently one of the publications of this house that is mentioned as *Bella edición* (p. 96, ll. 15 and 16).

P. 97, l. 11. Translate 'And what if he should marry her!'

P. 100, ll. 4-6. In his note to this passage, the editor seems to have lost track momentarily of the circumstances of the action already set forth. The meaning is something like this: 'who will get out of his head the third errand (the doing of) which he imputes to me?' or 'which he blames me for?' (Cf. p. 80, l. 23 and p. 81, l. 15). Rita is as much puzzled about the mysterious third errand as Lorenzo.

P. 100, ll. 6-7. *Que lo indague ó que reviente*. These lines are slightly ambiguous. I am inclined to supply *él* instead of *yo* and translate

'Let him find out (the truth) or die in the attempt'.

P. 105, l. 6. *Mar de fondo* is on p. 106, l. 3. The translation suggested, "An ocean in truth = a great mystery" does not seem very happy, and in fact there was no mystery in the matter for Fulgencio. The expression is to be taken figuratively in the sense of a domestic upheaval.

P. 117, l. 1. *A prevención*, not "to make sure of it" but 'to be in readiness' (nearly equivalent to *por si acaso*).

P. 140, l. 2, *gentes*. It is not necessary to supply *honradas*.

P. 143, l. 5, *de trapillo*, 'in house-dress' or 'negligée'.

P. 149, l. 15, *teño sufridas*. Although originally a Portuguese construction (Cf. Bello-Cuervo, note 97), the use of *tener* as an auxiliary with the past participle of a transitive verb may now be said to be sufficiently Spanish (*Id.* 441 and 708).

P. 174, ll. 1-2. *Y eres tú, tú quien afrenta la casa en que vivo yo*. Here it is a question of the agreement of a verb which has for its subject one of the relatives *el que* or *quien*, the antecedent being of the 1st or 2nd person. The editor quotes Bello-Cuervo (849) to the effect that in such cases it is better to put the verb in the 3rd person, as the author has here done. He adds that both agreements are found in actual usage, and cites several examples to illustrate each. Those showing the verb in the 3rd person are unexceptionable except that the second contains only the simple relative *que*. The examples which are intended to show the agreement of the verb with an antecedent of the 1st or 2nd person are as follows:

- (b) "Esa persona *soy yo*." (Juan Valera)
- "Quien la cuida *soy yo*." (José Echegaray)
- "El que desatina *eras tú*." (*Ibid.*)
- "Aquí el ignorante *soy yo*." (Pérez Galdós)
- "*Soy yo* quien se traslada." (Pérez Escrich)

Curiously enough none of these examples illustrates the agreement in question. The first and fourth contain no relatives. In the second, the subject of *soy* is *yo*; in the third, that of *eras* is *tú* and similarly in the fifth *yo* is the subject of *soy*. Examples of this construction

after *quien* or *el que* are comparatively rare and seem to be appropriate to emphatic or emotional style (Cf. Bello-Cuervo, note 110). Examples are:

Yo soy, señor, el que *vivo*
en vuestro reino olvidado.

(Núñez de Arce, *El haz de leña*, Act I, Scene IX).

¡Parece que vos
sois ahora el que *teméis*,
y mala cara *ponéis*
á los muertos?

(Zorrilla, *Don Juan Tenorio*, segunda parte, Act. I, Scene VI).

After *que*, the verb preferably agrees with the antecedent, as in the following:

Y tú, insensato,
que me llamas vil ladrón, . . .

(*Id.*, primera parte, Act IV, Scene X).

" . . . yo, que hasta hoy *consentí* en vuestro enlace con Isabel,
he visto por último que de él iba á resultar su desgracia y la vuestra."

(Hartzenbusch, *Los amantes de Teruel*, Act II, Scene VIII).

P. 187, l. 2. No verb is to be understood with *que se va*. *Que* is the relative, not the conjunction (Cf. p. 71, l. 10).

Following the notes is a complete list of the Portuguese and Galician words which appear in the text, with their Spanish equivalents, and the Latin etyma in those cases where the words in question are phonetic equivalents considered in their historical development. In the case of *carrapucheiriña*, where the student is referred to the note, page and line should be given (p. 148, l. 24), to facilitate future reference. At the close, the inquiring or ambitious student is referred to Menéndez Pidal, Cornu and Bourciez.

I have noticed the following misprints: P. x, foot-notes 1 and 2, read *Revue Hispanique*;—p. 6, l. 3, read *éa*;—p. 24, ll. 15-16 should be given to Fernando instead of to Antonia;—p. 50, l. 17, read *éa*;—p. 56, l. 15, read *circunstancias*;—p. 107, l. 13, read *regaló*;—p. 114, l. 9, read *construimos*;—p. 125, l. 4, read *esa*;—p. 131, l. 14, read *del*;—p. 180, l. 12, read *este*;—note to p. 100, ll. 6-7, read *reviente*;—note

to p. 105, l. 6, before *Mar de fondo* read p. 106, l. 3;—note to p. 106, ll. 5–6, read *lackey*;—note to p. 137, l. 2, read See p. 33, l. 12.

Withal the book is compact, well bound and printed, and convenient to use. It is a welcome addition to the small number of nineteenth century plays at present available for class use in this country. For students beyond the third semester of college work, it will be found to present admirable material for study, both along linguistic and literary lines, together with a Spanish atmosphere unusual in an American edition.

ARTHUR L. OWEN.

University of Kansas.

A History of French Literature, by C. H. CONRAD WRIGHT. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1912. xiv + 964 pp. 8vo.

M. Wright publie, après bien d'autres, une histoire de la littérature française des origines à nos jours. Il s'est proposé, dit-il en sa *Préface* (p. vii), d'écrire pour les lecteurs ou étudiants de langue anglaise un livre qui fût autre chose qu'une esquisse par trop sèche et qu'un simple répertoire de faits. Ne prétendant point connaître de première main tous les auteurs et toutes les œuvres, il s'en est souvent rapporté aux spécialistes dont il mentionne les travaux dans une copieuse bibliographie.

Voilà donc un manuel "scientifique" qui vise à être moins aride que les manuels ordinaires. But légitime et louable, assurément, mais but qu'on ne saurait atteindre, ce semble, qu'en sacrifiant l'analyse esthétique et les idées générales à la partie matérielle de l'histoire littéraire, ou inversement. J'ai l'impression que M. Wright n'a voulu faire aucun sacrifice: de là résulte, sauf erreur, le caractère le plus marqué de son livre, d'être incontestablement nécessaire . . . à un public presque impossible à définir. Les simples curieux d'histoire littéraire ne sauraient trouver qu'un plaisir médi-

ocre¹ en cet ouvrage trop copieusement nourri de faits et de dates. Les étudiants des *colleges* seront peut-être rebutés par l'ampleur du volume (880 pages d'un texte très compact), l'uniformité typographique, l'absence de sommaires, résumés ou manchettes indiquant les divisions de chaque chapitre ou le passage d'un auteur à un autre: le manuel dont ils ont besoin existe bien dans le livre de M. Wright, mais il faut commencer par l'en extraire. Quant aux étudiants avancés, ils ne pourront que se féliciter des efforts de M. Wright.²

Tout d'abord, la bibliographie (pp. 883–937) leur sera, sans aucun doute, fort utile. Elle comprend une partie générale (énumération des principaux instruments de travail — imprimés) et une partie "systématique" renvoyant aux différents chapitres du texte. Ces deux parties sont, à tout prendre, copieuses et solides. Il semble toutefois que M. Wright n'ait pas voulu nettement choisir entre une bibliographie critique et une bibliographie "pédagogique", d'où certaines bizarreries. Ainsi, dans la partie générale, on rencontre sans surprise (p. 893) la *Revue critique des livres nouveaux*, mais on est surpris de ne rencontrer ni la *Revue de philologie française et de littérature*, ni la *Revue de la Renaissance*, ni les *Annales romantiques*; pourquoi omettre, parmi les périodiques qui tiennent au courant de la science (p. 892), le *Kritischer Jahresbericht* de Vollmöller? Si l'on admet le dictionnaire de Richelet, pourquoi écarter celui de Furetière

¹ Je suis mauvais juge du style. Il m'a paru, à Pordinaire, neutre, froid et quelque peu hautain; de plus compétents affirment qu'il n'évite pas toujours la trivialité (cf. *The New York Post*, 3 août 1912).

² L'impression ne laisse presque rien à désirer. Pourtant il serait souhaitable que beaucoup de vers français fussent plus correctement cités; aux exemples relevés par M. Roustan (*Revue critique*, 7 décembre 1912, pp. 455–456, n.) on peut ajouter: pp. 20, 43, 75, 176, 507, 660, 668, 793, 809. Pour d'autres fautes d'impression dans des mots français, v. pp. 33, 73, 186, 723, 896; dans la *Bibliographie*, *passim*, l. Darmesteter au lieu de Darmsteter; p. 147, la *Concorde des deux langues* est à la page suivante la *Concorde des deux langaiges* (qui est le vrai titre); p. 606, l. *Le lépreux de la cité d'Aoste*; p. 776, l. *Madame Gervaisais*; p. 771, l. *Fromont jeune* . . .; p. 875, l. *La Chanson des gueux*.